Contents Volume 34:1 February 2011

von Hippel, W. & Trivers, R.
The evolution and psychology of self-deception 1

Open Peer Commentary

Bandura, A. Self-deception: A paradox revisited 16
Brooks, M. L. & Swann, Jr., W. B. Is social interaction based on guile or honesty? 17
Buss, D. M. Domains of deception 18
Dunning, D. Get thee to a laboratory 18
Egan, L. C. Self-deception is adaptive in itself 19
Frankish, K. Conscious thinking, acceptance, and self-deception 20
Frey, U. & Voland, E. The evolutionary route to self-deception: Why offensive versus defensive strategy might be a false alternative 21
Fridland, E. Reviewing the logic of self-deception 22
Funder, D. C. Directions and beliefs of self-presentational bias 23
Gangestad, S. W. Understanding self-deception demands a co-evolutionary framework 23
Gorelik, G. & Shackelford, T. K. Culture of deception 24
Harnad, S. Deceiving ourselves about self-deception 25
Heine, S. J. Evolutionary explanations need to account for cultural variation 26
Huang, J. Y. & Bargh, J. A. The selfish goal: Self-deception occurs naturally from autonomous goal operation 27
Humphrey, N. It takes a thief to catch a thief 28
Johansson, P., Hall, L. & Gärdenfors, P. Choice blindness and the non-unitary nature of the human mind 28
Kenrick, D. T. & White, A. E. A single self-deceived or several subselves divided? 29
Khalil, E. L. The weightless hat: Is self-deception optimal? 30
Kramer, P. & Bressan, P. Belief in God and in strong government as accidental cognitive by-products 31
Kurzban, R. Two problems with "self-deception": No "self" and no "deception" 32
Lu, H. J. & Chang, L. Self-deceive to countermine detection 33
McKay, R., Mijović-Prelec, D. & Prelec, D. Protesting too much: Self-deception and self-signaling 34
Mercier, H. Self-deception: Adaptation or by-product? 35
Pinker, S. Representations and decision rules in the theory of self-deception 35
Preti, A. & Miotto, P. Self-deception, social desirability, and psychopathology 37
Smith, D. L. Aiming at self-deception: Deflationism, intentionalism, and biological purpose 37
Suddendorf, T. Evolution, lies, and foresight biases 38
Troisi, A. Deception through self-deception: Take a look at somatoform disorders 39
Vrij, A. Self-deception, lying, and the ability to deceive 40

Authors' Reponse

von Hippel, W. & Trivers, R. Reflections on self-deception 41

Contents Volume 34:2 April 2011

Mercier H. & Sperber D.
Why do humans reason? Arguments for an argumentative theory 57

Open Peer Commentary

Baumeister, R. F., Masicampo, E. J., & DeWall, C. N. Arguing, reasoning, and the interpersonal (cultural) functions of human consciousness 74

Connolly, T. & Reb, J. Regret and justification as a link from argumentation to consequentialism 75

De Neys, W. The freak in all of us: Logical truth seeking without argumentation 75

Dessalles, J.-L. Reasoning as a lie detection device 76

Evans, Jonathan St. B. T. Reasoning is for thinking, not just for arguing 77

Fox, J. Artificial cognitive systems: Where does argumentation fit in? 78

Frankish, K. Reasoning, argumentation, and cognition 79

Godfrey-Smith, P. & Yegnashankaran, K. Reasoning as deliberative in function but dialogic in structure and origin 80

Harrell, M. Understanding, evaluating, and producing arguments: Training is necessary for reasoning skills 80

Johnson, J. A. The argumentative theory of reasoning applies to scientists and philosophers, too 81

Khlentzos, D. M. & Stevenson, B. True to the power of one? Cognition, argument, and reasoning 82

Kuhn, D. What people may do versus can do 83

Narvaez, D. The world looks small when you only look through a telescope: The need for a broad and developmental study of reasoning 83

Oaksford, M. Putting reasoning and judgement in their proper argumentative place 84

Opfer, J. E., & Sloutsky, V. On the design and function of rational arguments 85

Pietraszewski, D. What is argument for? An adaptationist approach to argument and debate 86

Poletiek, F. H. You can't have your hypothesis and test it: The importance of utilities in theories of reasoning 87

Sternberg, R. J. When reasoning is persuasive but wrong 88

Stupple, E. J. N., & Ball, L. J. The chronometrics of confirmation bias: Evidence for the inhibition of intuitive judgements 89

Uleman, J. S., Kressel, L. M., & Rim, S. Spontaneous inferences provide intuitive beliefs on which reasoning proper depends 90

Weber, E. U., and Johnson, E. J. Query theory: Knowing what we want by arguing with ourselves 91

Wiles, J. Reasoning, robots, and navigation: Dual roles for deductive and abductive reasoning 92

Wolfe, C. R. Some empirical qualifications to the arguments for an argumentative theory 92

Wu, K. C.-C. Deliberative democracy and epistemic humility 93

Authors' Response

Mercier, H. & Sperber, D. Argumentation: Its adaptiveness and efficacy 94

Contents Volume 34:3 June 2011

Précis

Carey, S. Précis of *The Origin of Concepts* 113

Open Peer Commentary

Allen, J. W. P. & Bickhard, M. H. You can't get there from here: Foundationalism and development 124

Burge, T. Border crossings: Perceptual and post-perceptual object representation 125

Butterfill, S. A. Infants' representations of causation 126

Gauker, C. Concepts are not icons 127

Gelman, R. The case for continuity 127

Gentner, D. & Simms, N. Language and analogy in conceptual change 128

Gopnik, A. A unified account of abstract structure and conceptual change: Probabilistic models and early learning mechanisms 129

Haman, M. & Hernik, M. Can multiple bootstrapping provide means of very early conceptual development? 130

Heintz, C. Presuming placeholders are relevant enables conceptual change 131

Hill, C. S. Can Carey answer Quine? 132

Keil, F. Graceful degradation and conceptual development 133

Kiss, S. The notion of incommensurability can be extended to the child's developing theories of mind as well 134

Korman, J. Concept revision is sensitive to changes in category structure, causal history 135

Landy, D., Allen, C. & Anderson, M. L. Conceptual discontinuity involves recycling old processes in new domains 136

Machery, E. What is the significance of *The Origin of Concepts* for philosophers' and psychologists' theories of concepts? 137

Mandelbaum, E. What is the narrow content of *fence* (and other definitionally and interpretationally primitive concepts)? 138

Mandler, J. M. A leaner nativist solution to the origin of concepts 138

Margolis, E. & Laurence, S. Beyond the building blocks model 139

Markman, A. B. Can developmental psychology provide a blueprint for the study of adult cognition? 140

McLaren, I. P. L., Wills, A. J. & Graham, S. Representation development, perceptual learning, and concept formation 141

Overmann, K. A., Wynn, T. & Coolidge, F. L. The prehistory of number concept 142

Poulin-Dubois, D. How to build a baby: A new toolkit? 144

Rips, L. J. & Hespos, S. J. Rebooting the bootstrap argument: Two puzzles for bootstrap theories of concept development 145

Ristau, C. A. Cognitive ethology, over-attribution of agency and focusing abilities as they relate to the origin of concepts 146

Schlesinger, M. & Amso, D. Oculomotor skill supports the development of object representations 147

Shea, N. Acquiring a new concept is not explicable-by-content 148

Spelke, E. S. Quinian bootstrapping or Fodorian combination? Core and constructed knowledge of number 149

Weiskopf, D. A. Language and mechanisms of concept learning 150

Xu, F. Rational constructivism, statistical inference, and core cognition 151

Author's Response

Carey, S. Concept innateness, concept continuity, and bootstrapping 152

Contents Volume 34:4 August 2011

Jones, M. & Love, B. C. Bayesian Fundamentalism or Enlightenment? On the explanatory status and theoretical contributions of Bayesian models of cognition 169

Open Peer Commentary

Al-Shawaf, L. & Buss, D. Evolutionary psychology and Bayesian modeling 188

Anderson, B. L. The myth of computational level theory and the vacuity of rational analysis 189

Baetu, I., Barberia, I., Murphy, R. A. & Baker, A. G. Maybe this old dinosaur isn't extinct: What does Bayesian modeling add to associationism? 190

Barsalou, L. W. Integrating Bayesian analysis and mechanistic theories in grounded cognition 191

Borsboom, D., Wagenmakers, E.-J. & Romeijn, J.-W. Mechanistic curiosity will not kill the Bayesian cat 192

Bowers, J. S. & Davis, C. J. More varieties of Bayesian theories, but no enlightenment 193

Chater, N., Goodman, N., Griffiths, T. L., Kemp, C., Oaksford, M. & Tenenbaum, J. B. The imaginary fundamentalists: The unshocking truth about Bayesian cognitive science 194

Danks, D. & Eberhardt, F. Keeping Bayesian models rational: The need for an account of algorithmic rationality 197

Edelman, S. & Shahbazi, R. Survival in a world of probable objects: A fundamental reason for Bayesian enlightenment 197

Fernbach, P. M. & Sloman, S. A. Don't throw out the Bayes with the bathwater 198

Glymour, C. Osiander's psychology 199

Gopnik, A. Probabilistic models as theories of children's minds 200

Hayes, B. K. & Newell, B. R. The uncertain status of Bayesian accounts of reasoning 201

Heit, E. & Erickson, S. In praise of secular Bayesianism 202

Herschbach, M. & Bechtel, W. Relating Bayes to cognitive mechanisms 202

Holyoak, K. J. & Lu, H. What the Bayesian framework has contributed to understanding cognition: Causal learning as a case study 203

Jenkins, G. W., Samuelson, L. K. & Spencer, J. P. Come down from the clouds: Grounding Bayesian insights in developmental and behavioral processes 204

Lee, M. D. In praise of Ecumenical Bayes 206

Markman, A. B. & Otto, A. R. Cognitive systems optimize energy rather than information 207

Navarro, D. J. & Perfors, A. F. Enlightenment grows from fundamentals 207

Norris, D. The illusion of mechanism: Mechanistic fundamentalism or enlightenment? 208

Pietraszweski, D. & Wertz, A. E. Reverse engineering the structure of cognitive mechanisms 209

Rehder, B. Taking the rationality out of probabilistic models 210

Rogers, T. T. & Seidenberg, M. S. Distinguishing literal from metaphorical applications of Bayesian approaches 211

Sewell, D. K., Little, D. R. & Lewandowsky, S. Bayesian computation and mechanism: Theoretical pluralism drives scientific emergence 212

Speekenbrink, M. & Shanks, D. R. Is everyone Bayes? On the testable implications of Bayesian Fundamentalism 213

Uhlmann, E. L. Post hoc rationalism in science 214

Authors' Response 215

Jones, M. & Love, B. C. Pinning down the theoretical commitments of Bayesian cognitive models

Contents Volume 34:5 October 2011

Elqayam, S. & Evans, J. St. B. T. Subtracting "ought" from "is": Descriptivism versus normativism in the study of human thinking 233

Open Peer Commentary

Achourioti, T., Fugard, A. & Stenning, K. Throwing the normative baby out with the prescriptivist bathwater 249

Bonnefon, J.-F. Norms for reasoning about decisions 249

Brase, G. L. & Shanteau, J. The unbearable lightness of "Thinking": Moving beyond simple concepts of thinking, rationality, and hypothesis testing 250

Buckwalter, W. & Stich, S. Competence, reflective equilibrium, and dual-system theories 251

Douven, I. A role for normativism 252

Dutilh Novaes, C. The historical and philosophical origins of normativism 253

Foss, J. Just the facts, and only the facts, about human rationality? 254

Fuller, T. & Samuels, R. Overselling the case against normativism 255

Girotto, V. Undisputed norms and normal errors in human thinking 255

Gold, N., Colman, A. M. & Pulford, B. D. Normative theory in decision making and moral reasoning 256

Hahn, U. Why rational norms are indispensable 257

Hrotic, S. Defending normativism 258

Kim, K. & Park, Y. Cultural and individual differences in the generalization of theories regarding human thinking 259

McNair, S. & Feeney, A. Norms and high-level cognition: Consequences, trends, and antidotes 260

Nickerson, R. S. Norms, goals, and the study of thinking 261

Oaksford, M. & Chater, N. The "is-ought fallacy" fallacy 262

Pfeifer, N. Systematic rationality norms provide research roadmaps and clarity 263

Pothos, E. M. & Busemeyer, J. R. A case for limited prescriptive normativism 264

Proust, J. Epistemic normativity from the reasoner's viewpoint 265

Quintelier, K. J. P. & Fessler, D. M. T. Naturalizing the normative and the bridges between "is" and "ought" 266

Schurz, G. Truth-conduciveness as the primary epistemic justification of normative systems of reasoning 266

Spurrett, D. Reason is normative, and should be studied accordingly 267

Stanovich, K. E. Normative models in psychology are here to stay 268

Sternberg, R. J. Understanding reasoning: Let's describe what we really think about 269

Stupple, E. J. N. & Ball, L. J. Normative benchmarks are useful for studying individual differences in reasoning 270

Sun, Y. & Wang, H. Probability theory and perception of randomness: Bridging "ought" and "is" 271

Thompson, V. A. Normativism versus mechanism 272

Waldmann, M. R. Neurath's ship: The constitutive relation between normative and descriptive theories of rationality 273

Weinberg, J. M. What is evaluative normativity, that we (maybe) should avoid it? 274

Authors' Response

Evans, J. St. B. T. & Elqayam, S. Towards a descriptivist psychology of reasoning and decision making 275

Erratum

Speekenbrink, M. & Shanks, D. R. Is everyone Bayes? On the testable implications of Bayesian Fundamentalism – Erratum 291

Contents Volume 34:6 December 2011

Müller, C. P. & Schumann, G. Drugs as instruments: A new framework for non-addictive psychoactive drug use 293

Open Peer Commentary

Ahmed, S. H. Toward an evolutionary basis for resilience to drug addiction 310

Ainslie, G. Drugs' rapid payoffs distort evaluation of their instrumental uses 311

Banaschewski, T., Blomeyer, D., Buchmann, A. F., Poustka, L., Rothenberger, A. & Laucht, M. Drugs as instruments from a developmental child and adolescent psychiatric perspective 312

Foxall, G. R. & Sigurdsson, V. Drug use as consumer behavior 313

Goudie, A. J., Gullo, M. J., Rose, A. K., Christiansen, P., Cole, J. C., Field, M. & Sumnall, H. Nonaddictive instrumental drug use: Theoretical strengths and weaknesses 314

Griffiths, M. D. Non-addictive psychoactive drug use: Implications for behavioral addiction 315

Kippin, T. E. Does drug mis-instrumentalization lead to drug abuse? 316

Lende, D. H. Drug instrumentalization and evolution: Going even further 317

Miller, G. F. Optimal drug use and rational drug policy 318

Móró, L. & Noreika, V. Sacramental and spiritual use of hallucinogenic drugs 319

Pickard, H. The instrumental rationality of addiction 320

Reid, A. Drug addiction finds its own niche 321

Spanagel, R. Why do we take drugs? From the drug-reinforcement theory to a novel concept of drug instrumentalization 322

Sullivan, R. J. & Hagen, E. H. But is it evolution. . .? 322

Swendsen, J. & Le Moal, M. Flaws of drug instrumentalization 323

Troisi, A. Psychoactive drug use: Expand the scope of outcome assessment 324

Van Gulick, R. Drugs, mental instruments, and self-control 325

Warburton, D. M. Aspects of nicotine utilization 326

Wu, K. C.-C. Governing drug use through neurobiological subject construction: The sad loss of the sociocultural 327

Authors' Response

Müller, C. P. & Schumann, G. To use or not to use: Expanding the view on non-addictive psychoactive drug consumption and its implications 328